GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS*
THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	**8005**		
Country/Region:	**Armenia**		
Project Title:	**Sustainable Land Management for Increased Productivity**		
GEF Agency:	**IFAD**	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	**GEF Trust Fund**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Land Degradation**
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):			
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$73,060**	Project Grant:	**$3,937,500**
Co-financing:	**$23,000,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$27,010,560**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	**June 01, 2015**
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Ulrich Apel**	Agency Contact Person:	**Rami Abu Salman**

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating **country eligible**?	12/01/2014 UA: Yes. Cleared	
	2. Has the **operational focal point** endorsed the project?	12/01/2014 UA: No. An OFP endorsement letter in GEF template format has not been provided. Please provide OFP endorsement letter asap as a precondition for a full project review. 12/23/2014 UA: OFP endorsement letter has been provided in correct form.	

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

[1] Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only . Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Cleared	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the **resources available** from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	To be reviewed based on endorsement letter. 12/23/2014 UA: Yes. Cleared	
	• the focal area allocation?	To be reviewed based on endorsement letter. 12/23/2014 UA: Yes. LD STAR for Armenia is $4.4 million. Cleared	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	n/a	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	n/a	
	• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	n/a	
	• focal area set-aside?	n/a	
Strategic Alignment	4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF **results framework and strategic objectives**? *For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be*	12/01/2014 UA: Not fully. LD-EA cannot be accessed through the full-size project modality. Total amounts in Table A and B need sum up to the same total amount. Please revise table A and/or B accordingly. Table D indicated CC STAR allocation	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).	being requested instead of LD? Please check and correct as needed. 12/23/2014 UA: Total amounts in Table A and B still differ. Table A amount should be reduced to match $3,937,500 as indicated in Table B and D. 01/29/2015 UA: Has been corrected. Cleared	
	5. Is the project consistent with the recipient **country's national strategies and plans** or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?	12/01/2014 UA: Yes. Cleared	
Project Design	6. Is (are) the **baseline project(s),** including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	12/01/2014 UA: Yes. But please shorten the background information in the PIF to the information that is relevant to the project (e.g. "Armenia is a small land-locked republic in the Southern Caucasus" etc. is not relevant). 12/23/2014 UA: Has been addressed. Cleared	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the **project framework** (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	12/01/2014 UA: Not fully. It is not fully clear what, exactly, GEF will be supporting in component 1 and what "principles of sustainable use of water and land resources" will be adhered	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		to. As this component has a high indicative allocation of GEF resources, please elaborate. Component 2 is clear and welcomed as it is fully in line with LD objectives. The project proponents might want to focus GEF funding support towards this component. Component 3 is clear. Please clarify if project Management Costs will be used to cover the additional costs for a CC Adaptation Project Manager? How much GEF funds are earmarked for international and national consultants in total? 12/23/2014 UA: Has been addressed. Cleared	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	12/01/2014 UA: Yes. Quantifiable targets will need to be provided at CEO endorsement stage. Cleared	
	9. Is there a clear description of: a) the **socio-economic benefits**, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	12/01/2014 UA: Yes. Cleared	
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	12/01/2014 UA: Not fully. Please include CC risks and mitigation measures. 12/23/2014 UA: Has been included. Cleared	
	12. Is the **project consistent and properly coordinated** with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	12/01/2014 UA: Yes. Cleared	
	13. Comment on the project's **innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up**. • Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. • Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. • Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.	12/01/2014 UA: Issues of innovation, sustainability and potential for scaling-up have been addressed; refer to A1.7 page 10f. Please clarify what the mentioning of the SCCF on page 11 means. 12/23/2014 UA: Mention of SCCF has been removed. Cleared	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	12/01/2014 UA: Please clarify if the IFAD loan is the only indicative co-financing or if the GoA and other sources will provide cofinance as well. 12/23/2014 UA: IFAQD/OFID loan of $23 million is the indicative co-financing at this stage. Cleared	
	17. At PIF: Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? At CEO endorsement: Has co-financing been confirmed?	12/01/2014 UA: Please refer question above. 12/23/2014 UA: Yes. Cleared	
	18. Is the funding level for **project management cost** appropriate?	12/01/2014 UA: Yes. Cleared	
	19. At PIF, is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? At CEO endorsement/ approval, if PPG is completed, did Agency	12/01/2014 UA: Yes. Within threshhold. PPG will be cleared in line with PIF clearance.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	report on the activities using the PPG fund?		
	20. If there is **a non-grant instrument** in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	n/a	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate **Tracking Tools** been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a **budgeted M&E Plan** that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	**24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?**	12/01/2014 UA: No. Please address clarification requests. Please note that an OFP endorsement letter is required before any further review comments can be provided. 12/23/2014 UA: The Resubmission has addressed all comments. However, table A still includes a higher total amount than in Table B and Table D. Please correct the amount in table A accordingly and re-submit the PIF document.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		01/29/2015 UA: The PIF is technically cleared by the Program Manager. It may be included in one of the upcoming work programs.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	**26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?**		
	First review*	December 01, 2014	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	December 23, 2014	
	Additional review (as necessary)	January 29, 2015	

* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**